

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objection

Claim 14 has been corrected as suggested to recite: "open service items".

35 U.S.C. §§ 102 / 103

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as allegedly being anticipated by Bansal et al., (U. S. Publication No. 2007/0219842 A1). Claims 14-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bansal et al., (U. S. Publication No. 2007/0219842 A1) in view of Katiyar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,732,399). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite: "the user interface (i) prompting a user to identify a customer in connection with the initiation of a service to be performed and (ii) displaying a list of equipment owned by the customer and a list of types of services that may be performed for each type of equipment in response to the selection of the customer to enable the user to select appropriate equipment and types of services for the service to be performed" (for support, see, inter alia, p. 14, line 28 to p. 15, line 12). Claim 1 has also been amended to recite: "without overlapping the planning board display, the alert display being displayed continuously" (for support, see, inter alia, specification FIG. 8).

Bansal fails to disclose an alert display that is concurrently and continuously displayed adjacent to a planning board display as recited in claim 1. FIG. 2 of Bansal includes a Planned Activities frame, a Unplanned Activities frame, and a Recommended Parts frame. FIG.2 (as well as the other figures) do not include an alert display but rather a pop up. Bansal par. 4, lines 15-18 also do not disclose or even suggest an alert display, but rather, this section states that activities can be scheduled within any given time constraints which can be imposed by service agreements with customers. Lastly, paragraph 69 of Bansal refers to the Planned Activities frame (which lists employees in relation to a daily schedule), the Unplanned Activities frame

(which identifies pending activities), and the Recommended Parts frame (which identifies parts), none of which constitute an alert display as recited in the claims.

Furthermore, Bansal fails to suggest an interface for identifying a customer, displaying a list of equipment in response to an identification of a customer as well as a list of types of services so that a user can readily initiate a service action for a customer (as recited in claim 1). Such an interface provides significantly enhanced usability as compared to conventional systems such as Bansal.

Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be allowable.

Claim 12 has been amended to recite: “wherein at least one of the first task item and the second item requires spare parts; wherein in response to a user initiating the scheduling of a service action via the graphical user interface, an external system is queried to determine whether the required spare parts are available, and if not, a date on which such spare parts are available, and a service schedule estimate including a planned start date and a planned end date for each task in the service action is presented via the graphical user interface” (for support, see, inter alia, specification p. 16, lines 17-24).

Bansal is silent as to querying an external system in order to determine whether spare parts needed for a particular task item are available, and if not, when they will become available as recited in claim 12.

Accordingly, claims 12 and 13 should be allowable.

Claim 14 has been amended to recite: “wherein in response to a user initiating the scheduling of a service action and assigning resources to the service action via the graphical user interface, it is determined whether non-resource contractual constraints exist that are based on contracts with a customer associated with the service action that constrain tasks for the service action, and if so, presenting a user with an alert indicating same” (for support, see, inter alia, specification p. 21, lines 19-25).

It is respectfully submitted that the planned activities frame of FIG. 2 of Bansal fails to suggest a work list providing a view of service order items for which a user is responsible. The planned activities frame simply identifies available personnel using a Gantt chart. There is no

suggestion that such planned activities comprise service order items for a particular user. In addition, the unplanned activities frame of Bansal simply relates to items that require scheduling, as opposed to items that have previously been scheduled and which have not yet been completed (as compared to the hot list recited in claim 14).

In addition, neither of Katiyar or Bansal suggest that non-resource contractual restraints can be checked to confirm whether there are constraints on a task as recited in claim 14. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Katiyar does not suggest an alert monitor in which alerts can be selected and a corresponding assignment highlighted as recited in claim 14. Rather, Katiyar describes generating a warning list that includes a list of events associated with an altered event. With the subject matter of claim 14, a list in a separate alert list can be selected and a corresponding service action in the planning board can be displayed.

Accordingly, claim 14 and its dependent claims should be allowable.

New claim 19 recites: "wherein the list of alerts is dynamically updated based on an importance factor associated with a corresponding customer for whom the service is being performed and based on a due date of a corresponding task or service order." (for support, see, inter alia, specification p. 25, lines 3-9).

Claim 19 is separately allowable in part, because, none of the cited reference suggest that alerts can be dynamically updated based on importance factors and due dates.

Concluding Comments

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. Applicant asks that all claims be allowed.

If there are any questions regarding these amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-349.

Respectfully submitted,



Carl A. Kukkonen, III
Reg. No. 42,773

Date: October 15, 2008

Address all written correspondence to
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
3580 Carmel Mountain Road, Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92130
Customer No. 64280
Phone: 858.314.1500
Fax: 858.314.1501